

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application and examined. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Popovic ("Physical-based Motion Transformation" (1999)) (hereinafter "Popovic1999"). Objections were raised for Figs. 1A and 1B.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Thomas Stevens for the telephonic interview conducted on February 25, 2005. A statement of the substance of the interview is being filed along with this response.

THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner indicated during the telephone interview that objections with respect to Figs. 1a and 1b would be withdrawn.

THE CLAIMS

Rejections under 35 USC 112

The use of the word "threshold" in the claims was explained to the Examiner during the telephone interview. The Examiner indicated that the 112 rejections would be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC 102

Differences between the pending claims and the Popovic1999 were explained to the Examiner during the telephonic interview. In light of the explanation, the Examiner agreed that the pending claims are not taught or suggested by Popovic1999. Examiner indicated that the pending claims would be allowed.

During the telephonic interview, Applicant explained that the independent claims cite two objects: a kinematic object (e.g., the superhero shown in Figs. 1a and 1b) and a dynamic object (e.g., the cape of the superhero shown in Figs. 1a and 1b) that is simulated using a physically based numerical technique. As recited in the independent claims, the dynamic object is associated with the kinematic object and the motion of the dynamic object is influenced by the motion of the kinematic object. Accordingly, in the claims, two objects are recited wherein the motion of one object is influenced by the motion of the other object. Further, the independent claims recite manipulating the motion of the dynamic object when the motion of the kinematic object exceeds a predetermined threshold. For example, the motion of the cape of the superhero is manipulated when the superhero experiences sudden unrealistic motion (e.g., accelerates upward at 100G's). This manipulation may allow the motion of the cape to appear realistic even when the motion of the superhero is not.

As explained to the Examiner during the telephone interview, the above concepts are not taught or suggested by Popovic1999. Popovic1999 teaches building a model based upon the motion of an object and then using that model to impart various motions to the same object. Popovic1999 fails to teach or suggest two objects wherein the motion of one object is influenced by the motion of the other object and wherein the motion of one object is manipulated when the motion of the other object exceeds a predetermined threshold, as recited in the claims. As a result, Applicant submits that the pending independent claims are not taught or suggested by Popovic1999. Applicant further submits that the dependent claims are also not anticipated or suggested by Popovic1999 for at least the same reasons as discussed above for the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend. The dependent claims are also patentable for additional reasons.

Applicant thus submits that the pending claims are in a condition for allowance as agreed to by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

S. B. Kotwal

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SBK:km
60432038 v1